



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

RS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,671	12/10/2001	Toyomichi Yamada	00990083AA	9873
30743	7590	11/16/2005	EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190			SKED, MATTHEW J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2655

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/007,671	YAMADA ET AL.	
	Examiner Matthew J. Sked	Art Unit 2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The objection to the specification is withdrawn in view of the amendment filed 09/02/05.
2. The objection to claim 4 is withdrawn in view of the amendment filed 09/02/05.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, necessitated by amendment.
4. It is noted that the applicant did not traverse the Official Notice taken in the previous Office Action and therefore it is taken to be admitted prior art (see MPEP 2144.03).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chanod et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,622,123) in view of Lissauer et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0135358A1).

As per claim 1, Chanod teaches a multilingual conversation assist system for assisting a conversation between a plurality of languages, comprising:

Art Unit: 2655

a first means for setting a conversational situation (phrasebook contains a collection of sentences that are organized by thematic hierarchy and searched by choosing a topic, col. 7, lines 20-37); and

a second means for displaying language units corresponding to the conversation situation, wherein the language unit is presented in a first language (presents the sample sentences corresponding to the topic to the user, col. 7, lines 20-37).

Chanod does not teach wherein displaying the language unit is made effectively using multimedia so each language unit is represented by a graphic image corresponding to a particular language unit, a phonetic expression of said language unit in second language and a voice output activation corresponding to the language unit presented in the second language.

Lissaur teaches a translation system where the translated phrases consist of graphic-image files and are output in audio hence the translated phrase must have a phonetic expression of the phrase (paragraph 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Chanod wherein displaying the language unit is made effectively using multimedia so each language unit is represented by a graphic image corresponding to a particular language unit, a phonetic expression of said language unit in second language and a voice output activation corresponding to the language unit presented in the second language as taught by Lissaur because it would better translate a user's intention hence facilitating communications between people who do not speak the same language.

7. As per claim 2, Chanod teaches the first means for setting the conversational situation displays predetermined options and has a structure for repeating a step one of said options a plural number of times (topic selected from a plurality of topics offered and because there are subtopics for each topic an option would be selected a plural amount of times, col. 7, lines 20-37).
8. As per claim 3, Chanod teaches the language units are stored as a database and wherein the language units corresponding to the set conversational situation are searched for and displayed (phrasebook searched by topic keyword, col. 7, lines 20-37).
9. As per claim 4, Chanod teaches wherein options are displayed by using said language units stored in said database or a part thereof (phrasebook may be searched by a list of presented keywords which would be a part of the sentences found, col. 7, lines 20-37).
10. As per claim 5, Chanod teaches wherein options over a plurality of stages for setting said conversational situation are stored in a first area of said database while said language units are stored in a second area of said database, and wherein one of said options is successively selected from said first area of said database to search and to display next-stage options in accordance with the selected option until one of final stage options is selected, and the language unit that corresponds to said selected option is searched from said second area of said database to be displayed (stores multiple topics each with subtopics hence multiple stages wherein the final subtopic selected is used to search for sentences from the phrasebook, col. 7, lines 20-37).

11. As per claim 6, Chanod teaches a plurality of language units are selected in a step of selecting options in a plurality of stages and wherein said selected plurality of language units are combined together and displayed (selects topic and subtopics hence a plurality of language units are selected and the results displayed would match the topic and subtopics chosen, col. 7, lines 20-37).
12. As per claim 7, Chanod teaches said selected plurality of language units are combined and displayed in compliance with a syntax rule previously stored in said second area of said database (returned sentences are translated and displayed according to a syntactic structure, col. 7, lines 38-55 and col. 8, lines 41-47).
13. As per claim 8, Chanod teaches said language unite includes a character expression in a first language (returns sample sentences that would be in the same language to be translated, col. 7, lines 20-37).
14. As per claim 11, Chanod teaches a storage medium in which said database is previously stored (phrasebook of source expressions is saved in memory on device, col. 6, lines 45-50).
15. As per claim 12, Chanod teaches a portable device provided with a storage unit in which said database is previously stored (Fig. 3, elements 320-340).
16. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chanod et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,622,123) in view of Lissauer et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0135358A1) and taken in further view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. Chanod teaches a wireless communication device (Fig. 3, elements 320-340).

Chanod and Lissaur do not specifically teach all or part of said database is downloaded by means of communication with a server that stores the database.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches that downloading databases from a server is notoriously well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Chanod and Lissaur to download the database from a server because it would save memory on the communication device.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Candelore (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0111791A1) and Lister et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0046059A1) teach multimedia translation systems.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2655

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Sked whose telephone number is (571) 272-7627. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MS
11/09/05



W. R. YOUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER